Appl. No. 10/576,550 Amdt. Dated: February 6, 2009 Reply to Office action of November 6, 2008

## **Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings include changes to Fig. 12 and Fig. 13.

Attachment: Replacement sheets.

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS** 

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the

present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action,

and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter that

Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has amended claims 1-4, 7, and 8. Applicant has added new claims 9 and 10.

Support for new claims 9 and 10 can be found in the application publication paragraphs 0073,

and 0076-0078 (No. 2007/0075956).

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) due to the "display

portion driving control unit; sequential scanning drive & interlaced scanning drive" being

claimed but not shown in the drawings. Also, the Examiner stated that Figs. 12 and 13 objected

to as being prior art by the specification but not being so labeled. Applicant has added the label

"Prior Art" to the drawings and submits the amended drawing for Figs. 12 and 13.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the "display portion driving control unit" is shown in

Fig. 1, element 19, and labeled "display portion controller". The operation of the "sequential

scanning drive" is shown in Fig. 3(a) and 3(b). Specifically, Figs. 3(a) and 3(b) show a one-line

inversion drive, which is a type of sequential scanning drive. Additionally, the operation of the

"interlaced scanning drive" is shown in Fig. 4(a) and 4(b). As with Fig. 3, a three-line interlace

drive is a type of interlaced scanning drive. Applicant asserts that both the sequential scanning

drive and interlaced scanning drive can be executed within the display portion driving control

unit. Additionally, 37 CFR 1.83(a) states that "conventional features disclosed in the description

Page 9 of 12

and claims, where their detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the

invention, should be illustrated in the drawing in the form of a graphical drawing symbol or a

labeled representation (e.g., a labeled rectangular box)." The location of the interlaced scanning

drive and sequential scanning is not essential to the proper understanding of the invention.

Figs. 3(a), 3(b), 4(a), and 4(b) provide the necessary information for proper understanding of the

invention. Therefore, it is not necessary to amend the drawings at this time, and Applicant

respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

The Examiner also objected to the abstract of the disclosure for being in excess of 150

words and in excess of a single paragraph. Applicant has amended the abstract and included

herewith. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended

claims 1-4, 7, and 8. The amendments, when taken in combination with the exploration provided

for the objection under 37 CFR 1.83(a), adequately define the structural cooperative relationships.

Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hamamura

et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0072589), hereinafter "Hamamura". Claim 1 has been

amended to include limitations from claim 6 not disclosed by Hamamura. Applicant has

included the limitation "wherein the display portion driving control unit changes the driving

operation, the display portion driving control means changes display contents of the display

portion before or after the changing of the driving operation." The Examiner cited paragraphs

0182, 0185, 0202, 0211-0213 of Hamamura for describing similar features. The Applicant

Page 10 of 12

respectfully asserts that none of these paragraphs disclose the new limitations in claim 1.

Specifically, in paragraph 0182, Hamamura discloses inverting image data on a display.

Paragraphs 0185 and 0202 disclose operational control of a backlight for the display. Paragraph

0201 discloses the method of controlling the backlight for the display. Paragraph 0213 discloses

that the backlight is activated when an operator presses a button on the phone. Therefore,

Hamamura fails to disclose that that the "display portion driving control means changes display

contents of the display portion before or after the changing of the driving operation" as claimed

in claim 1. Thus, as Hamamura fails to disclose each and every limitation set forth in amended

claim 1, Hamamura does not anticipate amended claim 1.

Claim 7 depends directly on claim 1, and thus is patentable for at least the same reasons

as the parent claim.

Claims 2-5 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Hamamura in view of

Yoneda et al. (US No. 2001/0026260), hereinafter "Yoneda". For at least the following reasons,

the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed. The asserted combination of Hamamura and

Yoneda, independently or in combination, does not teach or suggest all features of the claimed

invention.

Hamamura does not disclose a limitation wherein the "display portion driving control

means changes display contents of the display portion before or after the changing of the driving

operation" as claimed in claim 1. Nor does Yoneda disclose that the "display portion driving

control means changes display contents of the display portion before or after the changing of the

driving operation." Therefore, even if Hamamura were combined with Yoneda, every limitation

Page 11 of 12

of amended claim 1 would not be taught or suggested by the resulting combination. Thus, claims

2-5 and 8 are patentable for at least the same reasons as the parent claim.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully asserts that new claims 9 and 10 are not anticipated

by Hamamura or obvious under Hamamura and Yoneda because neither reference describes

changing a driving frequency as claimed.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present

application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is

determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to

initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the

present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to

our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NGB-40221.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:

/michaelwgarvey/

Michael W. Garvey, Reg. No. 35,878

1801 East 9th Street Suite 1200

Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108

(216) 579-1700

February 6, 2009

Page 12 of 12